

### REMARKS

In the *Office Action*, the Examiner rejected claims 27-49 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). Claims 27-33, 35, and 43-49 are amended. Claims 50-52 are new. Claims 34 and 41 are cancelled. Claims 27-33, 35-40, and 42-52 are pending. No new matter was added. Based on the above amendments and following remarks, Applicants request reconsideration and allowance of the application.

#### Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

On page 3, paragraph 3 of the *Office Action*, the Examiner rejected claims 27-49 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 6,269,369 (Robertson). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Independent claims 27, 35 and 43 are amended to include the recited language of “determine whether a defined period of time as defined by the second party during which the first party can access the selected field of personal information of the second party has expired” and if the first party is determined to have access to the selected field of the personal information of the second party within the defined period of time, provide the selected field of the personal information of the second party to the first party.” (emphasis added)

Robertson does not teach the features of determining whether a defined period of time as defined by the second party during which the first party can access the selected field of personal information of the second party has expired and if the first party is determined to have access to the selected field of the personal information of the second party within the defined period of time, provide the selected field of the personal information of the second party to the first party. The *Office Action* contends that this feature is taught in Robertson, col. 5, lines 40-51 and col. 7, lines 1-19 and in FIG. 14. *Office Action*, page 5. However, these cited passages of Robertson merely disclose an affinity table that

“stores information about the time period of a user’s affiliation with a particular group in the FromYear and ToYear fields 420-8, 420-10 so that the system may help users find their contemporaries,” such as the beginning and end dates of a person’s high school years. Robertson, col. 5, lines 40-51 and col. 7, lines 1-19. The cited passages of Robertson also state that each record is time-stamped so that the system may report to users when other users have joined a group. *Id.*

Robertson’s time period of a user’s affiliation with a particular group (such as the range of years that a first party claims to have attended a certain high school) does not teach, suggest or disclose the independent claims 27, 35 and 43 for a couple of reasons. First, the mere fact that a first party attended high school for a given number of years does not mean that the first party is granted access to a selected field of the personal information of the second party. Instead, as taught in paragraphs [0018], [0043] and [0048] of the present application as published, the instant technology allows for a second party to define the period of time that a first party is allowed to access a selected field of the personal information of the second party. In other words, the present application allows for the second party to have control over how long of a time interval that a first party may access the selected field of personal information of the second party. Second, Robertson merely teaches that a user can input the time period that he was affiliated to a group (such as a high school), but Robertson fails to disclose that such inputted information also controls who and for how long another party can view a selected field of personal information of the user. Robertson, col. 5, lines 40-51 and col. 7, lines 1-19.

Further, Robertson is directed to a networked shared contact manager in the form of a centralized system, as it requires that users must join affinity groups for which users can provide beginning and end dates in prescribed data fields (such as FromYear and ToYear fields 420-8, 420-10 in Robertson) to show

their affiliation to the group. Robertson, Title, Abstract and col. 5, lines 40-51 and col. 7, lines 1-19. In contrast, the present technology is a private information exchange between people which does not require a centralized system, the joining of affinity groups, or entering data in pre-prescribed data fields in order for a second party to designate a time interval for how long a first party can view a selected field of personal information of the second party.

Without conceding to the Examiner's rejections and for the purpose of expediting prosecution, Applicants have amended claims 27, 35, and 43 to include the claim language of "determine whether a defined period of time as defined by the second party during which the first party can access the selected field of personal information of the second party has expired" and and "if the first party is determined to have access to the selected field of the personal information of the second party within the defined period of time, provide the selected field of the personal information of the second party to the first party," thereby placing all remaining claims in condition for allowance. (emphasis added) Support for these amendments can be found throughout the Specification, including paragraphs [0018], [0043] and [0048]. Applicants reserve the right to pursue any or all of the original claims at a later time, either within the present application or in future application(s). Applicants do not believe any new matter has been introduced by these amendments.

Dependent claims 28-33 depend from allowable base claim 27 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons with respect to claim 27. Dependent claims 36-40 and 42 depend from allowable base claim 35 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons with respect to claim 35. Dependent claims 44-49 depend from allowable base claim 43 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons with respect to claim 43. Claims 34 and 41 are cancelled.

For at least these reasons, pending claims 27-33, 35-40, and 42-49 are now in allowable form.

#### New Claims 50-52

Dependent claims 50-52 are new. Support for claim 50 may be found throughout the Specification, including paragraphs [0008], [0011] and [0015]. Support for claim 51 may be found throughout the Specification, including paragraphs [0011], [0054] and [0056]. Support for claim 52 may be found throughout the Specification, including paragraph [0053]. No new matter has been added.

Dependent claims 50 and 51 depend from allowable base claim 27 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons with respect to claim 27. Dependent claim 52 depends from allowable base claim 35 and is therefore allowable for at least the same reasons with respect to claim 35.

For at least these reasons, new claims 50-52 are in condition of allowance.

### Conclusion

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant believes the rejections to the claims have been overcome, and that the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions regarding the case, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative.

Respectfully submitted,

Ajit S. Shah, et al.

Date: January 22, 2010

By: /Myrna M. Schelling/

Myrna M. Schelling, Reg. No. 54,426  
Carr & Ferrell LLP  
2200 Geng Road  
Palo Alto, CA 94303  
Phone: (650) 812-3400  
Fax: (650) 812-3444